E423
.G784

E 423
.G784
Copy 1

TO THE HON. W. J. GRAYSON.

Sir:

You have thought proper to publish a second edition of your letter on the dissolution of the Union, and to follow it by a reply to "One of the People." Your perseverance in this matter is my excuse for calling further attention to your position and views. In doing so, I shall endeavour to avoid such expressions as might injure your feelings, or seem to impute to you mercenary motives for the course you have pursued. But whilst I do not call in question your motives, I feel bound to urge certain matters, important to this discussion, which may not be altogether pleasant to you. As to any effect which your opinions might have in our own State, we have no fears whatever, for we are united and prepared for the emergency of disunion. But your letters are calculated to produce the impression abroad, that we have opposition in this matter at home, and it therefore becomes important that the contrary should be well known. You stand almost alone in the opinion you have expressed, and your position I regard as sufficiently accounted for by the fact, that you hold an honorable and lucrative office under the general government. I am aware that you contend, for the doctrine of independence in office, and that you have the right, notwithstanding your position, to express and publish your opinions. That, however, is not the point. The question is not one of right, but of undue influence. You surely do not mean to assert that the opinions of men are not ordinarily influenced by their interests. This would be a proposition so utterly untenable, that its refutation is accomplished by merely stating it clearly. Indeed, this abstract notion of official independence, which seems so manly in theory, has seldom been found a thing desirable in practice. Unfortunately for the theory, its applica-

tion has been chiefly on one side of the question. Very many office holders have zealously maintained the measures of their government, whilst few have been bold enough to assert their independence on the opposite side; fewer still have done so openly and over their proper signatures. Unless, therefore, you had furnished some evidence of your being exempt from the ordinary frailties of your race, the mere assertion of your right to independence in office, was nothing to the purpose. You still leave us fairly to the conclusion that your connexion with the government might be sufficient to account for your opinions.

This conclusion is strengthened by the fact, that before you were an office holder, you entertained opinions different from those you now express. The measures of the government to which you now advise submission, are closely kindred to those you once opposed. They are also far more oppressive and dangerous in their tendencies. Once in the exercise of your right to resist such measures, you were not easily alarmed, but even ventured to put in peril the existence of your State. Now, the union of the Southern States to resist like measures, seems to you the extreme of madness. But you say that you did not then advocate *disunion*. It is true, you did not. But you supported a measure far more dangerous, and not half so effective. So dangerous was the measure, that you did not hesitate to prepare arms and form companies of minute men for the emergency. But you claim that one may change, "that it is better to be right than to be consistent—that as we grow older, we should at least endeavour to grow wiser." This is all true, and yet if that change be in the direction of one's interest, he must expect to be judged by the common notions of human nature, and that the influence of his opinions will be thereby diminished. To this fate, however unwilling, you must submit in the present instance. Your arguments must stand by themselves, unsustained by the influence of your name, for under the circumstances of your case that name must lose its power.

But you have sought to strengthen yourself by an appeal to the patriots of other countries. You say that our government is their envy and admiration—that it realizes their brightest day dreams. You attribute the clearness of their vision in this matter to their elevation above the "smoke and dust" of our party disputes. I wonder that it did not occur to you, that elevations are not favourable positions for seeing things as they are. The traveller who sees a country only from its eminences, may well imagine that it is all beautiful and fertile, a very paradise for the habitation of man. But let him descend from his elevation and traverse its hills and plains, and he may then know something of its rugged roads and impassable swamps; he may no longer wonder why the husbandman desires to forsake the barren fields that so long have mocked his labors. Elevation and distance may be very proper aids to the poet and painter, but the men who have to do with real life prefer to have a nearer view of things. The outer and foreign aspect of a government may be very attractive, and yet, he who has felt its sectional injustice and bitter discords, may prefer anarchy to such rule.

The same objection applies to your appeal to the "men of the revolution,"—"the patriots of the old school." You say that "they had a larger experience, that they were sounder thinkers, and wiser men than those of the present day." This is indeed a strange position. It is difficult to imagine how you could have written such a sentence, without perceiving its utter nonsense. If regarded as at all applicable to the present discussion, it amounts to your maintaining, that they who formed our government, knew more of its workings than we do, who have had trial thereof for two generations; it asserts, that their guesses at the future were clearer than our knowledge of the past. This were indeed to stultify ourselves, that we might pay homage to the wisdom of the dead. Even if appeal to the wisdom of former times were pertinent to the question, I doubt whether their testimony would be wholly on your side. The extracts you have quoted

show that their authors prized the Union. But you have told us that it is well to grow wiser as we grow older, and it required but the experience of a few years to convince many of those who formed our constitution, that the Union was not to be adhered to under all circumstances. Mr. Jefferson saw disunion in the Missouri question; so did Mr. Pinckney. And there is not a doubt, but that for the compromise of that question, the Union would have been severed, with the approval of the very patriots to whose opinions you appeal. Claiming, then, that your arguments must stand in their own strength, let us consider your reasons for union, and then examine the causes for disunion.

You consider the confederation as the source of all our blessings. You maintain that to it are to be attributed the glory and prosperity we have already attained—that it has enabled us to bid defiance to foreign aggression—that it has given free trade to a continent larger than all Europe—that it has preserved us in internal peace, from border disputes, civil wars or military despotism. These blessings were enough to hallow the Union in our affections. Were the picture you have drawn only half real, I would heartily join you to cry woe upon the hand that would tarnish it. But the fierce and angry denunciations of a wronged people, proclaim it a dream of your heated fancy, a portrait in which scarcely one feature of the original is retained.

I would deny to the Union none of its merits. It was once needful to give us consideration abroad, and by it the powers of Europe fear and respect us. In that respect it has accomplished its purpose, and brought us successfully to the day of strength; this was a reason for its existence, but none for its continuance. We may now divide, and yet have all the strength necessary to the maintenance of our rights. Each portion would still be stronger than were the whole in the day of our struggles. If there be reasons for this division, it were folly to suffer a blind reverence for the past to hinder us. Such superstition would have ever prevented our independence

by binding us indissolubly to the government of England.

Your next claim for the Union, I cannot allow to be an unmixed blessing. It is much for a continent so large as ours to enjoy an unlimited intercourse, to be free from police, spy or custom house regulations; for each citizen of one State to have perfect liberty and privilege in every other, is truly desirable. But is it true that we enjoy equally such liberty? The New Englander may send his cloths and his brooms, his inventions and notions, and even his rum and whiskey, to every State of the Union and to the Territories; but the slave-holder may not send his slaves to the mines of California, or even sell them in the District of Columbia. The traveller from the North may traverse our States in any direction, and bring with him the servants to whom he is accustomed, and whose attendance are necessary to his comfort. Yet the Southerner who travels North, must leave at home the servants necessary to his family, and depend upon such service as accident or the power of money may furnish him. This perfect freedom of intercourse, is not only unequal in its operation, but is also dangerous to us. It admits to our society the enemy of our institutions, the disturber of our peace; it distributes through the slave-holding States the myriad missives of those, who would rejoice to see us engaged in a servile war. But suppose that all that you claim were admitted, and that this perfect freedom of trade and intercourse were an unmingled blessing; might it not still be purchased too dearly? You have heard of the lad who paid too much for his whistle, and there have been found in this respect, nations of grown up boys. In our case, we pay for this freedom of internal trade, at the price of a restricted commerce with the world. It has cost us the life blood of southern prosperity. By it, northern rapacity has torn our rich legacy from our grasp, and having grown strong upon our resources, now uses that strength to our injury. It were better for your cause that you had not turned our thoughts to this "*blessing*" of the Union, this precious *boon* of free trade, It suggests to us nothing

but remembrances of injury and injustice. It reminds us of the times when our State, even to obtain a measure of justice, niggardly doled out, found it necessary to prepare for war.

Nor will your claim, that the Union preserves our internal peace, be found to rest on any more substantial foundation. You have chosen to furnish us no proof whatever of this position. You have referred to no disputes between the States which the Union has been called on to settle. The General Government could have no power to settle differences between the States, except as an umpire in case of agreement to refer, and any other neutral government could as well exercise that power. That the General Government understand this to be its true position, is shown, by its forbearing to interfere in the differences between Virginia and New York, on the subject of fugitive slaves. And though South Carolina now enforces certain material restrictions upon all vessels of New York coming into her ports, and likewise defies the claim of Massachusetts as to her colored citizens; yet we have never heard that the General Government pretended a right to settle these differences. There is nothing then to show that the Union is the cause of our peace. The fact that other States, that were not united, have had constant feuds and wars with each other, is no proof that it would have been so with us. Such an argument is easily rebutted by referring to the Mexican States. They were united, and were also subjected to constant wars with each other, until their union ended in a central military despotism. We then, deny, that our peace has been attributable in any respect to the General Government. Our common interest, and community of feeling, arising from the joint struggles of the revolution, are the causes thereof. We had then no union, except such as allied sovereigns may have, and our union of feeling was stronger under that alliance, than it has ever been under the present form of government. In fact, the confederation has been the mother of discord and bitter heart-burnings. There all our differences have commenced

and widened. England and France are non-slave-holding countries, and yet, we have with them, not a mere show of peace, but real fellowship of feeling, whilst with the free States of our confederacy, we have constant contention and turmoil. Why this difference? Who can doubt that the union is the moving cause? And so long as the enemies of our instutions may use the power of the common government, to disturb us, just so long must we look for contention. The breach must continue to widen, until fierce and uncontrollable civil war be the result.

But suppose the union did give us peace, are there no dangers other than border wars? Every school boy has heard of the Scylla and Charybdis. You warn us loudly of the dangers of the one, but seem to be deaf yourself to the roarings of the other. Let us be careful, whilst we avoid the obscurity of petty States, that we do not subject ourselves to the tyranny of consolidation. Mexico has shared that fate. England, Scotland and Ireland, are now subject to one central power. Our own history has proved, that the General Government is fast tending that way, and that the States, with all their watchful jealousy, have not been able to resist her encroachments. She is fast centering all power in herself, and the time may soon come, when in the insolence of consolidated power, her sword may be cast into the scale that determines the dearest rights of the States. She may then indeed, give us peace, such peace as stern rulers give to those who are forced to submit. If it were therefore clear, that we have to choose between even the contention and obscurity of petty States, and the peace and glory of such a government—the result might be in favor of the former; unbroken peace, like internal free trade, may cost us too much. And if we must choose between terrible evils, the late measures of the General Government may be some earnest, as to which is likely to be the greater.

And now, if the question of disunion were to be determined upon the very matters in which you consider the Union so great a blessing, the decision might still be

against you. But when we consider the other great questions which you have not touched, or even hinted at, the matter becomes no longer doubtful. I might urge the fact, that we desire disunion, that we might be freed from the dominion of a majority, whose political creed is their interest, and whose religion is fanaticism. I might show that we consent to our own degradation, when we remain in common bonds with those who regard us as their moral and religious inferiors, and who use the common halls of our government, to give constant expression to that feeling. I might enlarge upon the iniquitous measure of the government, in the enactment of an unequal and oppressive tariff. It might be proved, that millions of our common treasure has been expended to advance the prosperity of the Northern States; but these, and all other minor matters, I consent to waive. The South has borne, and could yet bear them, and they sink into insignificance before the one great matter of federal injustice. The burden of that complaint, is, that the north constantly uses the power of the Union for the destruction of our institutions.

If this complaint be just, then no reasonable being can doubt, that we ought at once to sever this connection. Let us see whether this charge be justly made, and to do so, let us notice some of the long past, as well as the late measures of the government.

You cannot deny, that slavery is an institution that the South is determined to maintain. It is so interwoven with all her interests, that not only her prosperity, but her very existence is dependant upon it. Any one, therefore, who has any knowledge of the spirit by which this institution is maintained, must see that any direct attack upon it must prove vain and fruitless. Foreign powers have no means of reaching it, but by universal combination or open war, and these are forbidden by their own commercial interests. It remains, therefore, for our own government to destroy slavery if it ever be done, for no other power can do it. The North understands this full well, and hence its efforts to gain and use, to that end, the power of the government. No act indeed has been passed

for the abolition of slavery, this would have been to defeat their purposes; we were too strong for an open and direct attack. To use the moral weight of the government in condemning the institution; to repudiate slavery as inconsistent with our professions as lovers of freedom, to limit the area of slavery so as to diminish its weight in the government, and finally to render it unproductive, were more sure to lead to the end proposed. The wisdom of ages could devise no other method so certainly effective. And yet, these measures so sure to effect our ruin, have been adopted and carried out by the Union you so highly prize. Such has been the tendency of her acts from the time of the confirmation of the ordinance of 1787, down to the purchase of the territory of Texas. The act of confirmation excluded slavery from the rich Territories of the Northwest, thereby depriving slaveholding States of a share in the territory, once their own. True, the excuse then, was, the diminishing the inducement to the African slave-trade; the slave States then had the power, and fanaticism gained its end by a hollow pretence. Soon, however, the growing population of the free States, gave them the power in the house, and then the design of the North to direct the power of the government against the slave interest, became at once apparent. Every politician is familiar with the history of the Missouri question. The aim of the free States in refusing to that State admission into the Union, is well known; in this refusal they persisted, and to the shame and disgrace of the Southern States, they assented to a compromise, limiting the area of slavery. This compromise still stands upon the statute book, the solemn evidence that our government condemns and repudiates slavery. We are bound to believe, that the South acquiesced in this measure only from strong love to the Union; rather than sever the tie, she submitted to the disgrace, and hoped that here would be an end of it. Not so the North. With her, it was the entering wedge, and she waited only the time and opportunity for further aggression. Both have come, and well have they been used. When Oregon applied for a territorial government, there

was no fear of slavery being extended to that region, and yet the majority in Congress chose to permit her to remain without a government, rather than pass a bill in which there was no clause prohibiting slavery. Who can doubt, that the sole object for insisting upon that clause, was to brand the institution of slavery, with the disapprobation of the government? It can scarcely be thought that the North is weak enough to desire legislation, merely to insult us, or for idle, inoperative ends. Not so: the purpose was clear and avowed—to use against slavery the moral power of the Union. For this, the hollow Missouri compromise was rejected by the North; they never intended to keep it, or any other. The South true to her engagements, offered to adhere to that compromise, though it degraded her; but the North had gained new strength, and *no compromise with slavery*, became her motto.

Of a like character with the above, has been the course of the government in reference to the constitutional provision as to fugitive slaves. She passed the act of 1793, but made no adequate provision for its execution. The owner was permitted to seize his slave, (if he could catch him,) but it was made the duty of no officer to aid him. It was well known, that this law soon became odious to many of the free States, and that their officers were forbidden to aid in its execution; and yet Congress refused to provide for the deficiency. It was well known, that many of the judges required of the owner, claiming a slave, the most stringent evidence, and refused to be satisfied when the strictest rules of law were complied with; and yet the government neglected or refused to provide any remedy for the injured owner. This delay of the government continued, until fugitive slaves from the South have become so numerous in the Northern States,and in many of their cities, that they are sufficiently strong to combine,and take public measures for a common defence. In the mean time, a generation has grown up, educated in the belief that the government discountenanced the surrender of these fugitive slaves, and they now look upon this right of ours, as

one to be despised and resisted. Ministers boldly preach from the pulpit, that the fugitive slave has the right, nay that it his duty, to kill the man that attempts to recapture him; and the Rev. Theodore Parker, solemnly declares to a Boston congregation, that were he such fugitive, he would "kill the man, that laid hands on him, with as little compunction as he would brush a mosquito from his face." Large public meetings have advised resistance to the law, and pronounce its repeal. Do you pretend that the government is not responsible for this state of feeling? Her delays of justice, her criminal negligence, have produced it. The matter has been urged by Southern men, yet the power of the North has prevented action. If then, the current of opposition to our constitutional rights, has swelled into an uncontrollable whirlwind, it is because the government refused to check its incipiency. And now who can pretend that the present ineffectual attempt to enforce this constitutional provision, is meant as an act of justice to us? We want no such justice. It is but the flimsy covering, whereby to conceal from us the giant forms of injustice, which sprung full armed from the brain of fanaticism. At one sweep, slavery has been excluded from the vast territories of the West, and the shores of the Pacific,and in return—the fugitive slave law that slept so long, will be waked up for a season. Has the Almighty determined to destroy, that he should first make fools of us? Where has our reason fled, that the north should think thus to limit, weaken, and degrade us, whilst we, good easy victims, stand chuckling over the triumphs of the fugitive slave law? Unless the South is now true to herself, her doom is forever sealed, her sceptre has departed, and she must remain content to stand in the eye of the civilized world, as a governed, proscribed, and morally inferior people.

If all other proofs were wanting, of the determination of the government, to bring about this result, her late measures, rightly viewed, were sufficient to convince even the most sceptical. And here, let me remark, that in discussing those measures,I am not to be diverted from my purpose, by disputing with you, whether they be con-

stitutional or not. The constitution has been so often violated, in its spirit at least, that its infraction no longer excites attention. Let the constitutionality of the measures you contend for, be yielded, and the still, graver question remains, whether the acknowledged powers of the government have not been so directed as to inflict upon us irreparable injury. If so, my charge is made out, though I allege no excess of power, no infraction of the constitution. And now for the burden of those measures. You cannot have forgotten, that immediately after the commencement of the war with Mexico, the north proclaimed that there should be no more slave territory. The purpose to exclude this institution from all the territory then held or to be acquired by the United States, was boldly and openly avowed. Can you, or any other reasonable person deny, that this purpose has been successfully accomplished, and that, either directly or indirectly, by the measures of the general government? Does not the North claim, and the South admit, that slavery is excluded from the whole of those territories, and that they are irrevocably devoted to free-soilism? You clearly admit that such has been the result, when you undertake to show, that the government is not responsible for it, and amuse us with your quibble on the power of Congress over the Mexican law. I freely admit, that Congress has no right to pass a law, either establishing or prohibiting slavery in the territories. And yet I contend, that it is not only clear that she has the right to repeal all the Mexican laws of force in the territory acquired, but also that it was her *duty* to do it, so far as such repeal was necessary to give all her citizens equal rights therein.

I can scarcely suppose, that any one, expecting his opinions to be respected, would venture to assert, that the repeal of a prohibitory law, would amount to the establishment of the thing prohibited. Congress has no right to establish a religion, and yet it would have been her duty to repeal the Mexican law, prohibiting the protestant religion, if that had not been effected by the constitution. In repealing that law, no one would have supposed that the Protestant religion would have been thereby established.

Neither in repealing the law prohibiting slavery, would she have established it, but it would still be a matter to be prohibited or established, as the people in forming a State Constitution might elect. In refusing or neglecting this repeal, the government has palpably and purposely lent her power to the free-soilers, and has deprived us of our share of the territory. This purpose of government so apparent, as to the Mexican territory, is put beyond all dispute in the Texan purchase. By a pretence of settling a boundary line, which was not disputed until the free-soil movement grew into power, the government has applied ten millions of the public treasury to purchase the Territory of Texas, and that for the unconcealed purpose of subjecting it to the Mexican anti-slavery law. Will you pretend, that Congress is not responsible for the exclusion of slavery from this Territory? Will you say, that this too, is the operation of the Mexican law? I know not what a partisan of the Union might say to justify this matter, but this I know, that if an individual were to commit a like breach of trust, he would be regarded as unworthy the confidence or countenance of any honest man.

And now slavery has been excluded from California, New Mexico and a part of Texas. Directly or indirectly the Union has done it. These acts, constitutional or not, fill up the cup of our injustice. Added to the long list of measures tending that way, they establish conclusively the fixed purpose of the government to degrade, limit, and thus destroy our institutions. And yet you tell us not to be angry or indignant! to wait for something more definite! Have you ventured to look forward even for a few years, and to estimate the consequences of this delay. Remember, that in all our struggles with Northern aggression, her power in the House was ever checked by the equilibrium of the Senate. To destroy this equilibrium, was her constant aim. In this she has at last succeeded. Now the power is theirs in both houses, and in a few years, as the territories, which the freesoilers have torn from us, become peopled by emigrants from Europe, from the Northern States, and even by the adventurous from Southern States, that power

will swell into an irresistible majority. If in the day of equal power, we have had such earnest of aggression, what may we not expect in the day of their strength? Fanaticism is not accustomed to struggle for power without a purpose. As soon may you expect the tiger to abandon unhurt the victim it has within its power, as to hope that the North will deviate from its fixed purpose to abolish slavery. Let us sleep on now for a few years and we will then be roused to find the slaveholding States struggling with a government in which they will be a weak and hopeless minority. Confined to a limited area, surrounded and hedged in on all sides by a population hostile to their institutions, condemned by their own government to a moral inferiority, they will have no choice but to submit, and no rights but such as a majority may choose to allow them. Who of us is prepared for this? Who can look forward composedly to such a contingency as possible? And yet to avoid it, requires of us present action. The territories, of which we have been unjustly deprived, are yet unpeopled; a Southern confederacy might now tear them from the grasp of free-soilism · in spite of the stealth and treachery of an unjust government, we may still regain for ourselves room to live and grow. But if we submit now, those territories will soon grow into States, and, once admitted to the present Union, all hope of their sympathy or union with us will have passed away. We must then be contented to move in our prison bounds, thus limited by our own inactivity and fatal delay.

Since then we have so sensibly felt the injustice and partiality of the present government; seeing that under her rule our danger is imminent and our final destruction almost sure, it would ill become us to be frightened from our purpose, by the ghostly sound of a word, or by evil forebodings of consequences that may never follow. Disunion was a term once pronounced with hesitation and trembling, but that day has past. It may now serve to alarm those who require the lullabies of the nurse; for bearded men it has no terrors. You predict that it will be followed by separate State governments, and that

thus we shall become the prey of all, "a by-word among nations." Your prophetic vision seems in this matter to be somewhat obscured by an indefinable, hallowed cloud, which time has thrown over the present Union. You have even so far forgotten its history, as to imagine it to be hallowed by the struggles of the revolution. And yet you know that it was formed after the revolution had been successful, and even after two of the States had withdrawn from the old confederacy. So far from the present Union being the result of any consecration by our struggle for liberty, it was a matter of pure calculation of interest. The smaller States refused to join in it, until the larger ones consented to give up their territories. Even then care was taken to keep up the power of the former by an equality of representation in the Senate, and by a careful limitation of the powers of the government. The whole matter shows that the constitution was the result of calculation, and a careful balancing of power, and not the rushing together of a people bound to each other by a nameless sentiment. If considerations of common interest were sufficiently strong then to form the present Union, may they not prove equally strong to unite the South? What has happened before, is likely to take place again under similar circumstances. We are the same people; the interests of the South are more in common than were those of the old thirteen: we have more fellowship of feeling, and are more kindred in our association; the population of the several Southern States has been made up by emigration from one to the other; every thing conspires to make our Union likely, necessary, and desirable. Why then should we disturb ourselves with your ghostly predictions of "petty State governments," and "obscure wars?" Is it that our character has changed, and that instead of being a law and order loving people, we have become to prefer strife and misrule? Or is it that we have tasted so much of the bitterness of the present Union, that we shall be averse to another? Our experience of the latter might indeed be fatal, were it not that in all our just indignation and excitement, we can still see that our injus-

tice was only the abuse, and not the necessary result of the Union. But we are not prepared to reject entirely this machinery of prosperity and strength, merely because wicked hands once perverted it into an engine of destruction. Rather let us suppose that we have learned from the past lessons of wisdom, and that in a Southern confederacy we may unite the blessings and avoid the dangers of the present Union.

In conclusion, I desire to explain more fully my views of our true remedy. By present, immediate, urgent action, I do not mean separate State action. I consider the dissolution of the Union necessary to our safety, and a matter desirable in itself, I would therefore avoid all measures merely leading to a compromise. The North never has kept, never will keep to its engagements, and if its character in this respect were better, that would not alter the case, for compromises are not what we seek. We desire peace, safety, freedom, from aggression, and liability to insult. Any compromise of this question, would, itself be an insult. and would still leave in full action all the machinery of the government already in motion for our ruin. Nothing can stop this action, and put us in a position of safety, but a Southern confederacy. Believing this, I deprecate any movement, which might prevent or retard the Union of the South. That Union should be one of a people, roused to the same feeling, and joined together by a common interest. They should feel that they have joined willingly, and as equals, and that the cause of each, is the cause of all. This result could not be accomplished,if a single State were to precipitate measures,without due conference with her sister States. It becomes us therefore,first to exhaust all the measures which may promise to bring about this unanimity of action. It becomes us to make sure work in the present movement, for the opportunity once lost, may never again be reasonbly expected. Our action should be decided and prompt, but its purpose and aim should be, to bring the other States up to our position. We should make due allowance for their present situation. We have been united, whilst they have been divided, on the old party grounds.

They are now struggling to break from their former ranks, and take position in the new organization. This must be a work of time. The people must be taught that their old party leaders are deceiving them. Those leaders themselves, may, in many instances, be brought to a sense of their folly. If, whilst this struggle is going on, and a spirited and determined party in the other States are manfully battling for our cause, we should precipitate measures by acting alone, the result would be to change the issue, and in a great measure to paralyze the strength of those who are on our side. If we act separately before one or more of the other States be ready to move with us, our course will be the condemnation of their inactivity, and even should they afterwards join us, from necessity, it would be with a sullen spirit, and not with that alacrity and warmth which is so necessary to our common peace and strength. But if they refuse to follow us, the necessities of our position would force us into another compromise, which would serve as a mere patch, to cover and conceal the wounds it could never heal.

But let us hope for better things. The States that groan under the same injuries with us, are not likely to prove false to themselves. The progress of our cause has been even more rapid and irresistible than the most sanguine could have hoped for. But a year ago disunion was breathed only in whispers; now its banner is boldly raised in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and other Southern States. A bold and determined people are bearing it onward. The dissolution of the Union is almost inevitable; its end is nigh. We have but to encourage and cheer our sisters, and to prepare ourselves for the conflict, that is coming. This is no time to listen to the voice of passion, or to follow the councils of the rash. The issues are too momentous to be put in jeopardy by a heedless step. The occasion requires of us to prepare and husband our resources; to look to the great end to be reached, and coolly to adopt such measures as are sure to attain it. That end is the Union of the South, and a separation from the North. One ill ad-

vised act may raise an impassible barrier to the wave that is now rolling on to this result. Once hindered in its progress, it may break and roll backward forever.

Very respectfully,

your obedient servant,

ANOTHER OF THE PEOPLE.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 898 118 2

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 898 118 2